



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,191	12/02/2003	Senja Jasenka Petrujkic	7596-1U	6512
31292	7590	12/23/2005	EXAMINER	
CHRISTOPHER & WEISBERG, P.A. 200 EAST LAS OLAS BOULEVARD SUITE 2040 FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301			FABER, DAVID	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/726,191	Applicant(s) PETRUJKIC, SENJA JASENKA	
	Examiner David Faber	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the application filed 02 December 2003.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 8, 10, and 13 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: FIG.1, 130. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2178

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reulein et al (US PGPub 2003/0144982, filed 1/30/2002).

As per independent Claim 1, Reulein et al discloses a system comprising:

- a document management system coupled to a workflow engine; (Paragraph 0010; Paragraph 0030, lines 1-3: Discloses the use of a workflow process on document creation/editing and production using a role assignment. Thus, it is inherent an engine is used as the framework for the workflow process)
- a repository configured to store document fragments processed by different authoring roles managed through said workflow engine; and, (Paragraph 0023. FIG 1.: Contains different repositories in one big repository that includes storing document components)
- a content assembler coupled to said repository and programmed to produce a composite document from said document fragments. (Paragraph 0031, lines 1-4; Paragraph 0047, lines 1-3, 6-11: Discloses components being assembled into one or more XML documents.)

As per dependent Claim 4, Reulein et al further discloses comprising:

Art Unit: 2178

- a digest of textual elements coupled to said content assembler, each of said textual elements denoting individual ones of said fragments in respective documents.(e.g. Paragraph 0047, lines 6-11: discloses tag attributes (tag holders) are found in the XML components and are replaced by data from variable data files in response within the assembly subsystem.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 2, 5, 6-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reulein et al (US PGPub 2003/0144982) in further in view of Hoyt et al (US Patent #6,067,531, patented 5/23/2000).

As per dependent Claim 2, Reulein et al discloses a method further:

- a second repository coupled to said workflow engine (FIG 2; Paragraph 0036, lines 11-15: Discloses multiple repositories coupled to a workflow system)

However, Reulein et al fails to specifically disclose that one of the repositories is configured to store activities defining at least one business. On the other hand, Hoyt et al discloses the use of a contract database in which is accessed by a plurality of users

and stores contract component data defining the contract such as terms, modifications, and statuses. (FIG 4A-B; Column 37, Claim 1; Column 6, lines 27-32)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Reulein et al's method with Hoyt et al's method since Hoyt et al's method would have provided a method for using a computer system and network to automate contract negotiation, approval, and generation.

As per independent Claim 5, Reulein et al disclose a method comprising:

- applying modifications to selected document fragments through said authoring roles; and (Paragraph 0040, lines 24-26: Authors can check out and edit each document/component for which they been assigned to.)
- combining said document fragments to form a single composite document; and, (Paragraph 0047)
- rendering said document for viewing by at least one of said authoring roles. (Paragraph 00025, 0027: discloses users using the user interface to request document components or fill documents for viewing or editing. Thus, it is inherent that the document is rendered to a display unit in order for an author to be able to view the document(s). In addition, Paragraph 0040 discloses that users and authors are the same since based on the workflow process of being assigned tasks within each project to applicable users having an assigned role (Paragraph 0030).

However, Reulein et al fails to specifically disclose defining a business process having a plurality of activities and a plurality of authoring roles authorized to participate in said activities. On the other hand, Hoyt et al discloses a process method of negotiating and generating a contract with user classes that denote approval levels for contracts. Each contract is assigned a team associated with a permanent hierarchy and users from each class who are responsible for that particular contract. Each user class has their assigned role for each activity for negotiating/generating throughout the contract process; i.e. first class user comprises sales representatives etc. (Column 6, line 42 – Column 7, line 24)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Reulein et al's method with Hoyt et al's method since Hoyt et al's method would have provided a method for using a computer system and network to automate contract negotiation, approval, and generation.

As per dependent Claim 6, Reulein et al discloses a method further:

- the step of storing state information with said document fragments to indicate a state within said business process for a particular version of said document fragments. (Paragraph 0030 discloses the use of an audit trail stored in a repository (Paragraph 0023) that track XML components that contains a list of prior versions of each component with users name, and time/date information of each edit.)

As per dependent Claim 7, Reulein et al discloses a method:

- the step of combining individual ones of said document fragments (Paragraph 0031, lines 1-4; Paragraph 0047, lines 1-3, 6-11) having state information indicating a specified state. (Paragraph 0030)

As per independent Claim 8, Reulein et al discloses a method comprising:

- composing a document from a set of document fragments; (Paragraph 0031, lines 1-4; Paragraph 0047, lines 1-3, 6-11)
- assigning different ones of said document fragments to different ones of said multiple actors within different activities (Paragraph 0040, lines 24-26 discloses that authors check out and edit each document/component for which they been assigned. Authors are assigned through a workflow unit that directs the assignment of tasks within each project to applicable users (authors), each having an assigned role within the given project. Paragraphs 0042-0043 discloses other assigned roles such as a document specialist)

However, Reulein et al fails to specifically disclose providing a view to said composed document reflecting real-time modifications to said document fragments by said multiple actors. On the other hand, Reulein et al discloses after the document components gone through a workflow of edits and approvals (Paragraph 0040-0046), the assembler assembles the document components into completed XML format documents. (Paragraph 0047) Then the documents are submitted to a publishing unit where the documents are published into an industry standard format that includes PDF

and HTML format. (e.g. Paragraph 0032, 0049) It was well-known in the art at the time of applicant's invention that file formats such as PDF and HTML were use for viewing format and can be viewed on a computer screen or as a hardcopy printed out.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Reulein et al's method with the viewing method disclosed above since it would have provided the ability to view final documents for final approval and signature for education or business purposes.

In addition, Reulein et al fails to specifically disclose defining a business process having multiple activities and multiple actors performing said activities. However, Hoyt et al discloses a process method of negotiating and generating a contract with user classes that denote approval levels for contracts. Each contract is assigned a team associated with the hierarchy and users from each class.who are responsible for that particular contract. Each user class has their assigned role for each activity for negotiating/generating a throughout the contract process; i.e. first class user comprises sales representatives etc. (Column 6, line 42 – Column 7, line 24)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Reulein et al's method with Hoyt et al's method since Hoyt et al's method would have provided a method for using a computer system and network to automate contract negotiation, approval, and generation.

As per dependent claim 9, Reulein et al fails to specifically discloses the step of processing history of said document fragments in said view. However, Reulein et al

Art Unit: 2178

discloses of an audit unit that provides a full audit trail for each component that contains a list of prior versions. The audit unit is built into the document repository (FIG 1). It was well-known in the art at the time of applicant's invention that since the audit trail resided in the document repository, one of ordinary skill had the ability to provide a view of the audit trail by retrieving the information from the repository through an application program or an operating system file manager program able to display such information.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Reulein et al's method with the viewing of an audit trail since it would have provided a user or an administrator documented changes of previous versions and user and time information of the changes within a workflow process.

As per independent Claim 10, Claim 10 recites a computer program comprising a routine set of instructions which when executed by the machine performing the method of Claim 5. Therefore, Claim 10 is similarly rejected under Reulein et al and Hoyt et al.

As per dependent Claim 11, Claim 11 recites similar limitations as in Claims 6 and is similarly rejected under Reulein et al and Hoyt et al.

As per dependent Claim 12, Claim 12 recites similar limitations as in Claims 7 and is similarly rejected under Reulein et al and Hoyt et al.

As per independent Claim 13, Claim 13 recites a computer program comprising a routine set of instructions which when executed by the machine performing the method of Claim 8. Therefore, Claim 13 is similarly rejected under Reulein et al and Hoyt et al.

As per dependent Claim 14, Claim 14 recites similar limitations as in Claims 9 and is similarly rejected under Reulein et al and Hoyt et al.

8. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reulein et al (US PGPub 2003/0144982) in further in view of Sayal et al (US PG Pub 20030083910, published 5/1/2003).

As per dependent Claim 3, Claim 3 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and is rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Reulein et al discloses the use of workflow templates being selected for document/component editing (Paragraph 0040). However Reulein et al fails to specifically disclose that templates are stored in a second repository. On the other hand, Sayal et al discloses that XML template documents are stored in a separate repository for business-to-business service. (FIG 1; Paragraph 0087)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Reulein et al's method with Sayal et al's method of a template repository since Sayal et al's method would have enhanced the business processes with B2B interaction capability.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Crisan et al (US PGPub 2003/0191769): Discloses XML documents composed from database data.
- Bowman-Amuah (US Patent #6,742,015): Discloses a document management system providing base service patterns in a net centric environment.
- Dean et al (US PGPub 2002/0152244): Discloses XML documents being composed and decomposes from a database

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Faber whose telephone number is 571-272-2751. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8am to 430pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/726,191

Page 12

Art Unit: 2178

David Faber
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

DF


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER